DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 648 CE 044 628

TITLE	Survey on Coordination at Local and Regional Levels among Agencies and Organizations Serving Vocational Education, Job Training, and Related Service Needs.
INSTITUTION	Virginia State Council on Vocational Education, Blacksburg.
PUB DATE	Jan 86
NOTE	22p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Agency Cooperation; Community Colleges; *Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; Correctional Education; Dislocated Workers; Employment Programs; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Regional Cooperation; Rehabilitation Programs; School Districts; Secondary Education; Social Services; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Virginia

ABSTRACT

A survey sought information concerning the coordination of programs and services among agencies involved in job training, vocational education, and related services in Virginia. One mailing of the survey was made to 369 individuals (231 responded) in 7 groups of agencies: Job Training Partnership Act service delivery areas, dislocated worker programs, community colleges, rehabilitation services, school division, social services, and correctional education. A very high number of respondents rated coordination as satisfactory or better. The top three reasons for successful relationships represented 64 percent of the responses. Those responses involving personal contact, good working relationships; commitment to serve client needs, mutual clients; and excellent cooperation/communication related very closely to the top three factors identified as contributing most to a high level of successful coordination. The three factors selected by 80 percent of respondents included informal agreements, communications, or working relationships; personalities of agency staff members; and mutual clients. Factors selected as most inhibiting coordination were lack of communication and insufficient resources of personnel and time. (In addition to eight summary tables in the text, appendixes include tables with group responses by agency or organization. The instrument and correspondence are also appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270648

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted]

CE044628

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

VA Council on Vocational Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SURVEY ON COORDINATION AT LOCAL AND REGIONAL LEVELS
AMONG AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS SERVING
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING, AND RELATED SERVICE NEEDS
JANUARY 1986

The Virginia Council on Vocational Education and the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council, during the fall of 1985, conducted a survey of agencies at the local and regional levels involved in job training, vocational education, and related services. The survey sought information concerning the coordination of programs and services among these groups. This effort was a follow-up to a similar survey in 1984 of state agencies about coordination of services at the state level and the identification of client needs.

The survey was sent to 369 individuals and 231 or 63 percent responded. Only one mailing of the survey was made to seven groups of agencies and institutions. Table 1 identifies the groups included in the survey.

Table 1
SURVEY POPULATION

Agencies	Sent	Response	Rate
JTPA service delivery area	14	13	93%
Dislocated worker program	13	10	77%
Community college	35	25	71%
Rehabilitative services	14	10	71%
School division	131	82	63%
Social services	138	80	58%
Correctional education	24	11	46%
Total	369	231	63%

The following content represents a summary of the results of the survey from all respondents. Tables with group responses by agency or organization are included in the appendix. The survey form and correspondence requesting participation are also in the appendix.

The coordination efforts among agencies serving vocational education and job training needs were rated satisfactory or better by 82 percent of the respondents. The majority of responses, 169 of 224, rated coordination satisfactory or very good. Efforts were identified as excellent by 7 percent of the respondents. Table 2 reflects these ratings.

Table 2
RATING OF COORDINATION EFFORTS
AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

N=224

Ratings	No.	%
Excellent	15	7
Very Good	82	37
Satisfactory	87	39
Less Than Satisfactory	36	16
Non-Existent	4	2

The respondent was asked to identify agencies and organizations with which successful coordination has been achieved, to cite examples of this coordination, and to identify reasons for these successful relationships. The most frequent responses are included in Tables 3, 4, and 5 which follow. One or more agency or organization was identified by 96 percent of the respondents as a group with which their agency had successful coordination.

Table 3
IDENTIFICATION OF AGENCIES WITH WHICH
SUCCESSFUL COORDINATION HAS BEEN ACHIEVED

N=223

Agencies Identified	No.	%
Community college	106	48
JTPA SDA or contractor	88	39
School division	77	35
Rehabilitative services	57	26
Contractors specifically mentioned: Job Shop, Job Market, 70,001, community education, employment services, and Rooftop CAP	41	18
Social services	39	17
Virginia Employment Commission	29	13
State level departments of education, labor and industry, and probation	14	6
Other	29	13

Table 4
SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF COORDINATION

N=209

Examples	No.	%
Contractual agreements or the formal coordination of activities resulting in specific programs, courses, or activities that serve clients (i.e. tailoring a course for a specific group, pooling resources)	138	66
Informal exchange of information, general communication such as referral of clients and follow-up on clients	85	41
Formal articulation agreements	52	25
Regular meetings for the purpose of joint planning, regular consultation with an individual in another agency	46	22
Sharing membership on a PIC and advisory committee	10	5

Table 5
REASONS FOR SUCCESSFUL RELATIONSHIPS

N=204

Reasons	No.	%
The person-to-person contact, the people/person involved, good working relationships	75	37
Commitment on part of all to serve needs of clients, need to serve mutual clients	62	30
Have excellent cooperation/communication in place, spend time/effort at cooperation	40	20
Have mutual needs, common goals	27	13
A willingness to trust and cooperate, mutual respect, no competition or turf protection	22	11
The leadership at a particular agency, general professional, assertive administrators	17	8
Have worked out articulation agreements	17	8
Other	16	8

The survey asked that factors which contribute most to a high level of coordination be identified by a first and second choice from a given list. The summary in Table 6 combines the two selections of each respondent and does not reflect the first and second choices. Factors which reflect effective personal relationships between staff of the agencies and organizations were selected most frequently as contributing to coordination.

Table 6
FACTORS WHICH CONTRIBUTE MOST TO A HIGH LEVEL OF COORDINATION

N=227

Factors	No.	%
Informal agreements, communications, or working relationships	155	68
Personalities of agency or organization staff members	121	53
Mutual clients	84	37
Written agreements or memoranda of understanding	65	29
Legislated coordination	9	4
State administrative directive	9	4
Other	6	3

A question was also asked about factors which most inhibit coordination at the local level. First and second choices have also been combined in the summary in Table 7. Lack of communication and insufficient resources of personnel and time were identified most often as inhibiting coordination.

Table 7
FACTORS WHICH MOST INHIBIT COORDINATION

N=222

Factors	No.	%
Lack of communication	130	59
Insufficient resources (personnel, time, etc.)	106	48
Turf maintenance	73	33
Conflicting or dissimilar legislative mandates	50	23
Personalities of agency or organization staff members	44	20
Other	22	10

The final question asked if external factors limit coordination efforts at the agency or organization. The "yes" or "no" question was answered by 230 of the 231 respondents. External factors do not limit coordination reported 66 percent of the surveys. The 79 persons answering "yes" were asked to identify the external factors. The variety of responses were extensive. They have been grouped under 22 broad categories. Only those identified by 10 percent or more of the responses are shown in Table 8.

Table 8
EXTERNAL FACTORS LIMITING COORDINATION

N=79

Factors	No.	%
Total lack of/lack of adequate public transportation	15	19
Lack of resources, funding	13	16
Lack of knowledge/understanding on part of public/clients	11	14
Guidelines, mandates, red-tape, legislation, paperwork, control from Richmond	10	13
Lack of communication, cooperation, no support	9	11
Competition, fear of not getting credit for the activity	8	10

CONCLUSIONS

The responses substantially reflect that coordination efforts exist in a variety of settings and through numerous means. The number of respondents rating coordination as satisfactory or better is very high. The almost unanimous indication that successful coordination has taken place with the agency or organization responding is a reflection of positive feelings about what is happening. The survey does not, nor was it intended to, identify a relationship between the coordination that exists and the potential for maximum coordinated efforts. The response to successful coordination achieved represents, in many instances, coordination with only one other agency. What appears important is that many agencies or organizations are involved in some coordination efforts and feel positive about that experience.

The top three reasons for successful relationships represent 64 percent of the responses to that question. These responses involving personal contact, good working relationships, commitment to serve client

needs, mutual clients, and excellent cooperation/communication in place relate very closely to the top three factors identified as contributing most to a high level of successful coordination. These three factors selected by 80 percent of the respondents include informal agreements, communications or working relationships, personalities of agency staff members, and mutual clients. As might be expected, the factors selected as most inhibiting coordination were lack of communication and insufficient resources of personnel and time. Communications is a major contributor to coordination and lack of communication a major deterrent.

Two-thirds of those responding did not identify any external factors as limiting coordination. The external factors that were listed include some problem areas that are difficult to overcome. Lack of adequate public transportation, few jobs, limited economic development, lack of child care services, the geography of the area, waiting lists, and the distance to a training center have a direct impact on clients. Other factors identified related more to the agencies or organizations. Lack of communication and cooperation, mandates, red tape, paperwork, control from Richmond, and competition affect those delivering services.

Given the results of the survey, there are several activities that seem appropriate for consideration as follow-through efforts. One is to identify specific examples of effective coordination between two or more agencies or organizations. A description of what takes place, how it started, the benefits accrued, and how it is nurtured could be developed and disseminated as model activities. Another effort would be to determine at what degree the coordination successes are in a particular regional setting in relation to their potential. Support for specific activities to help expand coordination could then be provided. Finally, given the importance of communication as a factor that contributes most to coordination, ways to acquaint agency representatives with each other and explore new working relationships should be pursued. These activities might include in-service staff development on topics such as program planning concepts, evaluation techniques, use of labor market data, or other subjects that have universal application in the human services field. The reason for bringing the individuals together might be to eliminate barriers such as who gets credit for the client when cooperation takes place, or how to accommodate differences in agency guidelines.

The two councils thank those individuals completing the survey. The information provided about coordination of efforts at the local and regional levels is encouraging. There also are sufficient responses that identify problems related to coordination that are real and need attention.

APPENDIX

TABLE 2A

RATING OF COORDINATION EFFORTS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

RATINGS	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/EDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=12		N=80		N=25		N=10		N=77		N=10		N=10		N=224	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
EXCELLENT	1	8	4	5	1	4	0		5	6	1	10	3	30	15	7
VERY GOOD	5	42	34	43	13	52	4	40	22	29	2	20	2	20	82	37
SATISFACTORY	5	42	32	40	8	32	2	20	33	43	4	40	3	30	87	39
LESS THAN SATISIFACTORY	1	8	8	10	2	8	4	40	17	22	3	30	1	10	36	16
NON-EXISTENT	0		2	3	1	4	0		0		0		1	10	4	2

TABLE 3A

IDENTIFICATION OF AGENCIES WITH WHICH SUCCESSFUL COORDINATION HAS BEEN ACHIEVED

AGENCIES IDENTIFIED	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/SDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=12		N=78		N=25		N=9		N=78		N=11		N=10		N=223	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
COMMUNITY COLLEGE	5	42	57	73	0		3	33	33	42	1	9	7	70	106	48
JTPA/SDA OR CONTRACTOR	0		41	53	11	44	5	56	27	35	0		4	40	88	39
SCHOOL DIVISION	9	75	7	9	18	72	4	44	31	40	3	27	5	50	77	35
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES	5	42	21	27	3	12	0		26	33	0		2	20	57	26
CONTRACTORS SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED: JOB SHOP, JOB MARKET, 70,001, COMMUNITY ACTION, COMMUNITY EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT SERVICES, AND ROOFTOP CAP	2	17	7	9	4	16	2	22	24	31	0		2	20	41	18
SOCIAL SERVICES	4	33	25	32	5	20	3	33	1	1	0		1	10	39	17
VA EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION	3	25	6	8	4	16	1	11	12	15	2	18	1	10	29	13
STATE LEVEL DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION, LABOR AND INDUSTRY, AND PROBATION	4	33	0		0		0		0		10	91	0		14	6
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE, LOCAL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS, INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS	2	17	6	8	2	8	0		1	1	0		0		11	5
LOCAL COLLEGE AND/OR EXTENSION SERVICES	3	25	1	1	1	4	0		3	4	0		0		8	4
HEALTH DEPARTMENT, MENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT	0		0		0		1	11	4	5	0		0		5	2
DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM	0		1	1	1	4	0		1	1	0		0		3	1
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	0		0		2	8	0		0		0		0		2	1
TOTAL IDENTIFIED	37		172		51		19		163		16		22		480	

TABLE 4A

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF COORDINATION

EXAMPLES	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/SDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=11		N=72		N=24		N=9		N=72		N=11		N=10		N=209	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS OR THE FORMAL COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES RESULTING IN SPECIFIC PROGRAMS, COURSES, OR ACTIVITIES, THAT SERVE CLIENTS (I.E. TAILORING A COURSE FOR A SPECIFIC GROUP, POOLING RESOURCES)	10	91	42	58	18	75	3	33	47	65	10	91	8	80	138	66
INFORMAL EXCHANGES OF INFORMATION, GENERAL COMMUNICATION SUCH AS REFERRAL OF CLIENTS AND FOLLOW-UP ON CLIENTS	5	45	21	29	6	25	6	67	40	56	1	9	8	80	86	41
FORMAL ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS	3	27	35	49	13	54	1	11	0		0		0		52	25
REGULAR MEETINGS FOR THE PURPOSE OF JOINT PLANNING, REGULAR CONSULTATION WITH AN INDIVIDUAL IN ANOTHER AGENCY	2	18	14	19	8	33	1	11	16	22	4	36	1	10	46	22
SHARING MEMBERSHIP ON A PIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE	2	18	7	10	0		0		1	1	0		0		10	5
TOTAL EXAMPLES	22		119		45		11		104		15		15		331	

TABLE 5A

REASONS FOR SUCCESSFUL RELATIONSHIPS

REASONS	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/EDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=12		N=68		N=24		N=9		N=74		N=7		N=10		N=204	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
THE PERSON-TO-PERSON CONTACT, THE PEOPLE/PERSON INVOLVED, GOOD WORKING RELATIONSHIPS	4	33	25	37	8	33	6	67	26	35	1	14	5	50	75	37
COMMITMENT ON PART OF ALL TO SERVE NEEDS OF CLIENTS, NEED TO SERVE MUTUAL CLIENTS	4	33	22	32	6	25	1	11	27	36	1	14	1	10	62	30
HAVE EXCELLENT COOPERATION/ COMMUNICATION IN PLACE, SPEND TIME/EFFORT AT COOPERATION	5	42	14	21	1	4	2	22	13	18	2	29	3	30	40	20
HAVE MUTUAL NEEDS, COMMON GOALS	2	17	6	9	3	13	0		14	19	1	14	1	10	27	13
A WILLINGNESS TO TRUST AND COOPERATE, MUTUAL RESPECT, NO COMPETITION OR TURF PROTECTION	0		11	16	4	17	0		6	8	0		1	10	22	11
THE LEADERSHIP AT A PARTICULAR AGENCY, GENERAL PROFESSIONAL, ASSERTIVE ADMINISTRATORS	2	17	7	10	0		1	11	5	7	1	14	1	10	17	8
HAVE WORKED OUT ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS	1	8	5	7	1	4	3	33	4	5	1	14	2	20	17	8
LOCALLY HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF EACH OTHER'S PROGRAM THROUGH COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS	1	8	5	7	1	4	2	22	2	3	0		1	10	12	6
FOR EFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES	3	25	0		0		0		0		0		0		3	1
MANDATED REQUIREMENTS	1	8	0		0		0		0		0		0		1	0
TOTAL REASONS	23		95		24		15		97		7		15		276	

TABLE 8A

FACTORS WHICH CONTRIBUTE MOST TO A HIGH LEVEL OF COORDINATION

FACTORS	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/EDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=11		N=60		N=25		N=10		N=60		N=11		N=10		N=227	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
INFORMAL AGREEMENTS, COMMUNICATIONS, OR WORKING RELATIONSHIPS	7	64	53	88	20	80	5	50	55	89	6	55	9	90	155	68
PERSONALITIES OF AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION STAFF MEMBERS	6	55	46	58	13	52	5	50	36	45	6	55	9	90	121	53
MUTUAL CLIENTS	6	55	16	20	6	24	8	80	48	60	0		0		84	37
WRITTEN AGREEMENTS OR MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING	1	9	31	39	9	36	2	20	14	18	6	55	2	20	65	29
LEGISLATED COORDINATION	0		7	9	0		0		1	1	1	9	0		9	4
STATE ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTIVE	1	9	2	3	1	4	0		2	3	3	27	0		9	4
OTHERS:																
MUTUAL BENEFITS, HAVE SAME NEEDS AND GOALS	0		1	1	0		0		1	1	0		0		2	1
MORE RESOURCES; AVAILABILITY OF JOBS, TRANSPORTATION, AND TRAINING	0		0		0		0		1	1	0		0		1	0
ADVISORY COMMITTEE	0		1	1	0		0		0		0		0		1	0
DISREGARD OF TURF MAINTENANCE	0		0		0		0		1	1	0		0		1	0
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING SERVICE	0		1	1	0		0		0		0		0		1	0

TABLE 7A (page 1)

FACTORS WHICH MOST INHIBIT COORDINATION

FACTORS	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/EDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=11		N=78		N=25		N=10		N=77		N=11		N=10		N=222	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
LACK OF COMMUNICATION	6	55	53	68	10	40	7	70	40	52	7	64	7	70	130	59
INSUFFICIENT RESOURCES (PERSONNEL, TIME, ETC.)	7	64	37	47	6	24	1	10	47	61	5	45	3	30	106	48
TURF MAINTENANCE	2	18	29	37	17	68	5	50	14	18	3	27	3	30	73	33
CONFLICTING OR DISSIMILAR LEGISLATIVE MANDATES	4	36	13	17	7	28	3	30	19	25	3	27	1	10	50	23
PERSONALITIES OF AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION STAFF MEMBERS	2	18	16	21	7	28	3	30	11	14	2	18	3	30	44	20
OTHERS:																
DISTANCE TO TRAINING, LACK OF TRANSPORTATION AND DAY CARE FOR CLIENTS, FINANCIAL PROBLEMS	0		0		0		0		4	5	0		0		4	2
FAILURE TO USE NET-WORKING TO MEET COMMON GOALS, LACK OF INFOR-MATION ABOUT FUNDED PROGRAMS, TIMELINESS OF INFORMATION, NOTHING WRITTEN, LACK OF INTER-AGENCY CONTINUITY	0		0		0		0		2	3	1	9	0		3	1

(continued) TABLE 7A (page 2)

FACTORS WHICH MOST INHIBIT COORDINATION

FACTORS	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/EDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=11		N=78		N=25		N=10		N=77		N=11		N=10		N=222	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
OTHERS: (CONTINUED)																
NEED FOR QUICK RESULTS, NUMBERS HARD TO ACHIEVE IN RURAL AREAS, SERVING CLIENTS MOST APT TO BE SUCCESSFUL TO MAINTAIN FUNDS	0		1	1	0		0		2	3	0		0		3	1
INFLEXIBLE OPENING/ CLOSING DATES FOR COURSES, DIFFERENT SCHEDULES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE DRAWBACK TO ARTICULATION	0		1	1	0		0		0		0		1	10	2	1
UNEMPLOYMENT FACTORS, LACK OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	0		0		0		0		2	3	0		0		2	1
LACK OF FUNDS, LONG DISTANCE PHONE CALLS	0		0		0		0		2	3	0		0		2	1
NONE	0		2	2	0		0		0		0		0		2	1
OUR CLIENTS HAVE POOR PLACEMENT RECORDS	0		0		0		0		1	1	0		0		1	0
CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE/ YOUNG OR ADULT	0		0		0		0		1	1	0		0		1	0
AVAILABLE TIME	0		0		1	4	0		0		0		0		1	0
INSURANCE COMPANY	0		1	1	0		0		0		0		0		1	0

TABLE 8A (page 1)

EXTERNAL FACTORS LIMITING COORDINATION

FACTORS	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/SDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=8		N=20		N=10		N=4		N=32		N=3		N=2		N=79	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL LACK OF/LACK OF ADEQUATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	1	13	0		1	10	0		13	41	0		0		15	19
LACK OF RESOURCES, FUNDING	3	38	2	10	3	30	0		5	16	0		0		13	16
LACK OF KNOWLEDGE/ UNDERSTANDING ON PART OF PUBLIC/CLIENTS	1	13	4	20	2	20	1	25	3	9	0		0		11	14
GUIDELINES, MANDATES, RED TAPE, LEGISLATION, PAPERWORK, CONTROL FROM RICHMOND	2	25	1	5	3	30	0		3	9	0		1	50	10	13
LACK OF COMMUNICATION, COOPERATION, NO SUPPORT	1	13	2	10	0		0		5	16	1	33	0		9	11
COMPETITION, FEAR OF NOT GETTING CREDIT FOR THE ACTIVITY	0		2	10	1	10	2	50	2	6	0		1	50	8	10
LACK OF TIME/PERSONNEL	0		5	25	1	10	0		0		0		0		6	8
THE GEOGRAPHY OF AREA, THE PHYSICAL DISTANCE TO TRAINING CENTER	0		2	10	1	10	0		2	6	0		0		5	6
ATTITUDES OF OTHERS TOWARD VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, WELFARE CLIENTS, GENERAL ATTITUDE OF ELITISM OF PUBLIC AND LEGISLATORS	0		2	10	1	10	0		2	6	0		0		5	6
LACK OF VARIETY OR THE APPROPRIATE TRAINING, WAITING LISTS FOR CERTAIN TRAINING	0		0		0		0		4	13	0		0		4	5

[continud] TABLE 8A (page 2)

EXTERNAL FACTORS LIMITING COORDINATION

FACTORS	AGENCIES RESPONDING													
	JTPA/SDA		SCHOOL DIVISION		COMMUNITY COLLEGE		REHAB. SERVICES		SOCIAL SERVICES		CORRECTION EDUCATION		DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM		TOTAL	
	N=8		N=20		N=10		N=4		N=32		N=3		N=2		N=79	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
LACK OF JOB, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	0		0		0		0		3	9	0		0		3	4
LACK OF/OR LIMITED CHILD CARE	0		0		0		0		3	9	0		0		3	4
GOALS OF OTHER AGENCIES, GOALS OF AGENCY STAFF	0		0		1	10	0		2	6	0		0		3	4
JTPA ONLY WANTS TO SERVE THOSE WHO WILL SUCCEED	0		0		0		0		2	6	0		0		2	3
PRISON SECURITY	0		0		0		0		0		2	67	0		2	3
OTHERS:																
SHORT SIGHTED ACTIVITIES	0		1	5	0		0		0		0		0		1	1
ILLITERACY	0		0		0		0		1	3	0		0		1	1
SCHOOLS END UP PAYING MOST COST	0		1	5	0		0		0		0		0		1	1
SCHOOLS ARE EXPECTED TO ALTER PROGRAMS TO SERVE CLIENT NEEDS	0		1	5	0		0		0		0		0		1	1
NO CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF WHO SERVES WHO	0		0		0		0		1	3	0		0		1	1
MORE OF OUR CLIENTS OVER 21 THAN THE PIC WILL SERVE	0		0		0		0		1	3	0		0		1	1
PERSONALITIES	0		0		0		1	25	0		0		0		1	1
TOTAL FACTORS	8		23		14		4		52		3		2		106	

Virginia Council on Vocational Education

Post Office Box U • Blacksburg, Virginia 24060 • 703/961-6945

October 15, 1985

TO: Individuals With Responsibility for Vocational Education, Job Training, Dislocated Worker Programs, Rehabilitative and Social Services

FROM: Mr. Ronald C. Wehn, Chairman
Virginia Council on Vocational Education

Mr. Philip G. Hug, Chairman
Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council

The Virginia Council on Vocational Education and the Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council want to know the extent to which the various programs serving vocational education, job training, and related service needs represent a coordinated approach at the local level. You are part of a major component in the delivery system to meet the needs of citizens, and the enclosed survey has been developed to secure your views on this important issue.

The survey is short and will only take fifteen minutes of your time, but the information you provide will be extremely valuable. A self-addressed, stamped return envelope has been included for your convenience. Please return the completed survey by October 31, 1985.

The data collected will be used only in summary form. If you would like a copy of the survey results, we will be glad to send it to you.

jc

Enclosures

PERCEPTIONS OF COORDINATION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Please complete the survey and return in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Data collected will be used only in summary form.

Identify the type agency or organization you represent by checking the appropriate space.

( ) JTPA Service Delivery Area
( ) School Division
( ) Community College
( ) Rehabilitative Services
( ) Social Services
( ) Correctional Education
( ) Dislocated Worker Program

A. Rate the coordination efforts, at the local level, among agencies and organizations serving vocational education and job training needs? (Please check only one response.)

Excellent	Very Good	Satisfactory	Less Than Satisfactory	Non-Existent
( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

B. Identify the agencies/organizations with which you have achieved successful coordination.

Cite specific examples of this coordination.

Identify the reasons for these successful relationships.

(QUESTIONS CONTINUED ON BACK)

C. Only select two factors as your response for each of the following questions. Rank your first and second choice by identifying them as 1 and 2 respectively.

Generally, which factors contribute most to a high level of coordination at the local level?

( ) 1. mutual clients
( ) 2. written agreements or memoranda of understanding
( ) 3. informal agreements, communications, or working relationships
( ) 4. personalities of agency or organization staff members
( ) 5. legislated coordination
( ) 6. state administrative directive
( ) 7. other (please identify)

Generally, which factors most inhibit coordination at the local level?

( ) 1. lack of communication
( ) 2. conflicting or dissimilar legislative mandates
( ) 3. insufficient resources (personnel, time, etc.)
( ) 4. turf maintenance
( ) 5. personalities of agency or organization staff members
( ) 6. other (please identify)

D. Are there external factors which limit the coordination efforts of your agency or organization? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, please identify the factors.

E. Identify the JTPA Service Delivery Area in which you work by checking the appropriate space. See the enclosed list of SDA designations by jurisdiction.

( ) I ( ) II ( ) III ( ) IV ( ) V ( ) VI ( ) VII
( ) VIII ( ) IX ( ) X ( ) XI ( ) XII ( ) XIII ( ) XIV

RETURN SURVEY BY OCTOBER 31, 1985

Return survey to:

Virginia Council on
Vocational Education
P. O. Box U
Blacksburg, VA 24060

If you have questions, please contact:

George Orr 703/961-6945
Susan Brewster 804/786-7876
Tom Blackstock 804/786-8078

SERVICE DELIVERY AREA DESIGNATIONS BY JURISDICTION

I. SDA - ONE, Inc.

Counties:				City:
Buchanan	Lee	Scott	Wise	Norton
Dickenson	Russell	Tazewell		

II. New River/Mount Rogers Employment and Training Consortium

Counties:					Cities:	
Bland	Floyd	Grayson	Pulaski	Washington	Bristol	Radford
Carroll	Giles	Montgomery	Smyth	Wythe	Galax	

III. Fifth District Employment and Training Consortium

Counties:		Cities:	
Alleghany	Craig	Clifton Forge	Salem
Botetourt	Roanoke	Covington	Roanoke

IV. Shenandoah Valley Service Delivery Area

Counties:				
Augusta	Clarke	Highland	Rockbridge	Shenandoah
Bath	Frederick	Page	Rockingham	Warren

Cities:		
Buena Vista	Lexington	Waynesboro
Harrisonburg	Staunton	Winchester

V. Northern Virginia Manpower Consortium

Counties:		Cities:	
Fairfax	Prince William	Fairfax	Manassas
Loudoun		Falls Church	Manassas Park

VI. Alexandria/Arlington Job Training Consortium

County:	City:
Arlington	Alexandria

VII. Piedmont Service Delivery Area

Counties:					City:
Albemarle	Fauquier	Greene	Madison	Orange	Charlottesville
Culpeper	Fluvanna	Louisa	Nelson	Rappahannock	

VIII. Central Piedmont Employment Consortium

Counties:				Cities:	
Amherst	Bedford	Franklin	Patrick	Bedford	Lynchburg
Appomattox	Campbell	Henry	Pittsylvania	Danville	Martinsville

IX. South Central Employment and Training Consortium

Counties:				
Amelia	Charlotte	Greensville	Mecklenburg	Prince George
Brunswick	Cumberland	Halifax	Nottoway	Surry
Buckingham	Dinwiddie	Lunenburg	Prince Edward	Sussex

Cities:		
Colonial Heights	Hopewell	South Boston
Emporia	Petersburg	Farmville

X. Job and Training Assistance Programs

City:
Richmond

XI. Capital Area Training Consortium

Counties:			
Charles City	Goochland	Henrico	Powhatan
Chesterfield	Hanover	New Kent	

XII. Bay Area Job Training Consortium

Counties:				
Accomack	King and Queen	Lancaster	Northampton	Spotsylvania
Caroline	King George	Mathews	Northumberland	Stafford
Essex	King William	Middlesex	Richmond	Westmoreland

City:
Fredericksburg

XIII. Greater Peninsula Job Training Consortium

Counties:		Cities:	
Gloucester	York	Hampton	Poquoson
James City		Newport News	Williamsburg

XIV. Southeastern Tidewater Area Manpower Authority

Counties:	Cities:		
Isle of Wight	Chesapeake	Norfolk	Suffolk
Southampton	Franklin	Portsmouth	Virginia Beach

BEST COPY AVAILABLE